REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-14, 16, 17, 19-26 and 29 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 8-14, 16, 17, 19-26 and 29, at paragraph 2 of the Final Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Cohen (US 6,477,595 B1), in view of Shaffer (US 6,145,083). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

None of the cited references, including Cohen and Shaffer, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 1. As stated by the Office, Cohen does not disclose or suggest blocking logic to selectively initiate a blocking signal to disable communications received from an interface to a wide area network from being sent to an end-user computer over an interface to a local area network, as recited in Claim 1. Likewise, Shaffer does not disclose blocking logic to selectively initiate a blocking signal to disable communications received from an interface to a wide area network from being sent to an end-user computer over an interface to a local area network, as recited in Claim 1. Rather, Shaffer discloses a screen saver that is "configurable with respect to selecting a particular time period, so that the screen saver switches the computing device to a locked mode when the computing device is idle for a period exceeding the preselected period." (Shaffer, col. 5, ll. 21-25.). Further, Shaffer discloses that "the locked mode inhibits access to user data within the local memory, controls the display at the computer monitor, and restricts communication with the network via the network link." (Shaffer, col. 5, line 29-31). Thus, Shaffer discloses a screen saver capability that restricts functions at the computing device. Shaffer does not disclose initiating a blocking signal at a router to disable communications received at one interface of the router from being sent to the end-user computing device via another interface of the router, as recited in Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-4, 6 and 8-9 depend from Claim 1. Hence, the asserted combination of Cohen and Shaffer fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency from Claim 1.

In addition, none of the cited references, including Cohen and Shaffer, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 10. In contrast to Claim 10, Cohen discloses a digital subscriber line (DSL) multiplexer used in conjunction with a DSL modem to provide a reliable high speed connection for an end-user. (Cohen, Abstract). As stated previously, Shaffer discloses a screen saver that "switches the computing device to a locked mode" that "inhibits access to user data within the local memory, controls the display at the computer monitor, and restricts communication with the network via the network link." (Shaffer, col. 5, ll. 21-25, 29-31). Neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose or suggest a method that includes initiating a blocking signal at routing equipment to establish a blocking condition, where the blocking signal blocks data received at the routing equipment from a wide area data network connection from being communicated from the routing equipment to the end-user computer via a local data connection, as recited in Claim 10. Thus, Claim 10 is allowable.

Claims 11-14 and 16-17 depend from Claim 10. Hence, the asserted combination of Cohen and Shaffer fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency from Claim 10.

Further, none of the cited references, including Cohen and Shaffer, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 19. In contrast to Claim 19, Cohen discloses a digital subscriber line (DSL) multiplexer used in conjunction with a DSL modem to provide a reliable high speed connection for an end-user. (Cohen, Abstract). Shaffer discloses a screen saver that "switches the computing device to a locked mode" that "inhibits access to user data within the local memory, controls the display at the computer monitor, and restricts communication with the network via the network link." (Shaffer, col. 5, ll. 21-25, 29-31). Neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, discloses a method of routing data at digital subscriber line equipment that includes, initiating a blocking signal at the digital subscriber line routing equipment, the blocking signal, where the blocking signal blocks data from being communicated by a first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment. Thus, Claim 19 is allowable.

Claims 20-22 depend from Claim 19. Hence, the asserted combination of Cohen and Shaffer fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency from Claim 19.

Additionally, none of the cited references, including Cohen and Shaffer, disclose or suggest the specific combinations of Claim 23 and Claim 26. As stated previously, Cohen discloses a digital subscriber line (DSL) multiplexer used in conjunction with a DSL modem to provide a reliable high speed connection for an end-user. (Cohen, Abstract). Shaffer discloses a screen saver that "switches the computing device to a locked mode" that "inhibits access to user data within the local memory, controls the display at the computer monitor, and restricts communication with the network via the network link." (Shaffer, col. 5, ll. 21-25, 29-31). Neither Cohen, nor Shaffer discloses a router that includes blocking logic to selectively initiate a blocking signal to selectively disable communications from being sent over the first interface to at least one of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network while allowing communications to be sent over the first interface to at least one other of the plurality of end-user computers in the local area network, as recited in claims 23 and 26. Additionally, neither Cohen, nor Shaffer, disclose or suggest initiating a blocking signal at the router, the blocking signal selectively blocking data originating from a wide area network data connection from being communicated to one or more of a plurality of inactive end-user computers while allowing data originating from the wide area network data connection to be communicated to at least one of the plurality of the end-user computers that remains in an active state, as recited in Claim 26. Thus, Claims 23 and 26 are allowable.

Claims 24-25 depend from Claim 23. Claim 29 depends from Claim 26. Hence, the asserted combination of Cohen and Shaffer fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency from Claims 23 and 26.

Claims 5, 18 and 27-28 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 5, 18 and 27-28, at paragraph 3 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Cohen (US 6,477,595 B1), in view of Shaffer (US 6,145,083), and in view of Evans (US 6,807,666). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 5, 18, and 27-28 depend from Claims 1, 10 and 26, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Evans does not disclose or suggest the elements of Claims 1, 10 and 26, which are not disclosed or suggested by Cohen and Shaffer. Thus, Claims 5, 18, and 27-28 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from Claims 1, 10 and 26.

Additionally, none of the cited references, including Cohen, Shaffer and Evans, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 5. Evans teaches a user configurable period of inactivity after which the user's computer switches to a logon screen. (Evans, col. 5, line 31-34). Evans does not teach a user configurable period of inactivity after which blocking logic at a router initiates a blocking signal to disable communications from being sent over an interface of the router to a local area network connection at an end-user computer, as recited in Claim 5. Thus, the asserted combination of Cohen, Shaffer and Evans fails to disclose or suggest each element of Claim 5.

Further, none of the cited references, including Cohen, Shaffer and Evans, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 18. Evans teaches a user configurable period of inactivity after which the user's computer switches to a logon screen. (Evans, col. 5, line 31-34). Evans does not teach receiving user defined idle time information and modifying an idle time inactivity threshold after which a blocking signal is initiated at routing equipment to disable communications from being sent from the routing equipment to an end-user computer, as recited in Claim 18. Hence, the asserted combination of Cohen, Shaffer and Evans fails to disclose or suggest each element of Claim 18.

In addition, none of the cited references, including Cohen, Shaffer and Evans, disclose or suggest the specific combinations of claims 27-28. Evans teaches a single computer shared by multiple users that switches to a logon screen after a period of inactivity. (Evans, col. 5, line 31-34, 59-60). Evans does not disclose or suggest detecting resumed activity from one or more of a plurality of end-user computers or allowing communications to be sent from routing equipment to one or more of the plurality of end-user computers previously in an inactive state, as recited in claims 27 and 28. Thus, the asserted combination of Cohen, Shaffer and Evans fails to disclose or suggest each element of claims 27-28.

Claims 7, 15 and 30 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 7, 15 and 30, at paragraph 4 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Cohen (US 6,477,595 B1), in view of Shaffer (US 6,145,083), and in view of Gerszberg (US 6,510,152 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 7, 15, and 30 depend from Claims 1, 10 and 26, which Applicants have shown to be allowable.

Gerszberg does not disclose or suggest the elements of Claims 1, 10 and 26, which are not disclosed or suggested by Cohen and Shaffer. Thus, Claims 7, 15, and 30 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from Claims 1, 10 and 26.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

_08-21-06_
Date

Chad M. Herring
Chad M. Herring, Reg. No. 41,067
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)

Page 12 of 12   U.S. App. No.: 10/623,274